IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE K.M.JOSEPH

WEDNESDAY, THE 1ST AUGUST 2007 / 10TH SRAVANA 1929

WP(C).No. 23142 of 2007(E)

PETITIONER:

SACHU T.RUSSAK, SIGNPOST MEDIA,
33/605, DEVELOPMENT PLOT NO.100
SOUTH KALAMASSERY.

BY ADV. SRI.A.S.P.KURUP
SRI. SADCHITH P. KURUP

RESPONDENTS:

----

1. **KALAMASSERY MUNICIPALITY REPRESENTED ITS SECRETARY, MUNICIPAL OFFICE, KALAMASSERY.**

2. **THE SECRETARY, KALAMASSERY MUNICIPALITY MUNICIPAL OFFICE, KALAMASSERY.**

BY ADV. SRI. M.K.ABOOBACKER (SC)

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 01/08/2007, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

K. M. JOSEPH, J.

W.P.C. NO. 23142 OF 2007 E

Dated this the 1st August, 2007

JUDGMENT

Petitioner challenges Ext.P2. Case of the petitioner, in brief, is as follows:

Petitioner entered into an agreement with the respondent Municipality for the purpose of erecting sodium vapour lamps free of cost. In lieu of the same, the petitioner was to be given the right to place advertisement boards on the lamp posts. While the petitioner was satisfactorily executing the work, the second respondent issued Ext.P2 notice directing stopping of the work. Petitioner made representations. I heard the learned standing counsel appearing for the respondent Municipality also. He submits that Ext.P2 is only a notice to which the petitioner has made Ext4s.P3 and P4 and the same will be considered by the second respondent. In such circumstances, the Writ Petition is disposed of directing the second respondent to consider Exts. P3 and P4 and take a decision in accordance with law, after

affording an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner also, within a period of one month from today.

K. M. JOSEPH, JUDGE

kbk.